DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 276 UD 035 798

AUTHOR	Hall, Georgia; Harvey, Brooke
TITLE	Building and Sustaining Citywide Afterschool Initiatives: Experiences of the Cross-Cities Network Citywide Afterschool Initiatives.
INSTITUTION	Wellesley Coll., MA. National Inst. on Out-of-School Time.
PUB DATE	2002-11-00
NOTE	59p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Institute on Out-of-School Time, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, 106 Central Street, Wellesley, MA 02481-8203. Tel: 781-283-2547. For full text: http://www.niost.org/ publications.html.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	*After School Programs; Community Involvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Extended School Day; Financial Support; Governance; Local Government; Partnerships in Education; Program Evaluation ; Public Schools; *School Community Relationship; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Los Angeles County Schools CA; New York (New York); Boston Public Schools MA; Denver Public Schools CO; Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

This paper highlights the experiences of several citywide after school initiatives from the Cross-Cities Network, describing activities and strategies that contributed to building operational and sustainable citywide delivery of out-of-school time programs. The paper presents evidence of success and notes lessons learned, identifying key elements for building high quality citywide initiatives and exploring the processes taken to get there. The eight initiatives profiled were chosen because they represent diverse approaches to organizing citywide after school initiatives. Each program has a different history and differs widely on structure, governance, mission, goals, strategies, scope of service, roles, functions, and funding. Information about each initiative was obtained through network meetings, site visits, surveys, phone calls, interviews, and publications. The initiatives are: Denver Public Schools, Department of Community Education, Denver, Colorado; the After- School Corporation, San Diego, California; San Diego "6 to 6," San Diego, CA; Boston 2:00-6:00 After-School Initiative, Boston, Massachusetts; St. Louis Public Schools, Community Education Initiative, St. Louis, Missouri; San Francisco Beacon Centers, San Francisco, California; Beyond the Bell, Los Angeles, California; and Project Lift-Off, Seattle, Washington. Three appendices present an overview of the Cross-Cities Network, elements for building Citywide Afterschool Initiatives, and data table of Cross-Cities Network Initiatives. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 478 276

Building

Experiences of the Cross-Cities Network Citywide Afterschool Initiatives

and Sustaining

Citywide Afterschool Initiatives

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. Erskine
Nat'l Inst. on Out-of-School Time
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2B

National Institute on Out-of-School Time

Georgia Hall
Brooke Harvey
November 2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD 035 798

Table of Contents

3 **Introduction**

6 **Denver Public Schools, Department of Community Education**
Denver, CO

10 **The After-School Corporation**
New York, NY

15 **San Diego "6 to 6"**
San Diego, CA

20 **Boston 2:00-to-6:00 After-School Initiative**
Boston, MA

25 **St. Louis Public Schools, Community Education Initiative**
St. Louis, MO

29 **San Francisco Beacon Centers**
San Francisco, CA

35 **Beyond the Bell**
Los Angeles, CA

40 **Project Lift-Off**
Seattle, WA

45 **Framing the Issues**

50 **Notes**

51 **Appendix A**—Overview of the Cross-Cities Network

52 **Appendix B**—Elements for Building Citywide Afterschool Initiatives

54 **Appendix C**—Data Table of Cross-Cities Network Initiatives

Introduction

BUILDING AND SUSTAINING CITYWIDE AFTERSCHOOL INITIATIVES

The experiences of the 21 cities involved in the Cross-Cities Network have confirmed that there is no singular recipe for building a citywide afterschool initiative. Development of a citywide initiative is highly dependent on the leadership in place, the historic traditions and characteristics of the city, and the on-going turf and political struggles that dominate the agendas of local stakeholders. Those involved in citywide system-building activities have found that to focus work on one element of a citywide system is ineffectual without also simultaneously building the other elements of the system (see Appendix B.) This non-linear development approach was certainly the experience of the cities involved in the Cross-Cities Network.

There has been growing interest nationally in organizing the delivery of out-of-school time programs into coordinated citywide initiatives. In many cities, initiatives led by mayor's offices, departments of health and human services, school districts, and intermediary organizations have been launched, with intentions to provide out-of-school time programs that are safe, engaging, and foster the positive development of children and youth. Some initiatives provide direct services to children, others are focused on technical assistance and /or management, and all provide overall leadership and system design. What all these initiatives have in common is the goal of creating institutional and broad infrastructure support for activities and programs that contribute to child and youth development in the out-of-school time hours.

Today there are approximately six million children K-8 who participate in before and afterschool programs (U.S. Deptartment of Education, 1999). The numbers who still desire options for affordable, quality programs during the hours before and after school are larger. The U.S. General Accounting Office estimates that in 2002, the current number of out-of-school time programs will meet as little as 20% of the demand in some urban areas (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1998). One step taken towards meeting the alignment crisis between needs and capacity has been the development of citywide strategies. Some of the benefits of a citywide strategy over fragmented individually operating programs are:

- Opportunity for community coordination;
- Clearinghouse for data collection;
- Infrastructure of facilities and training;
- Evaluation and assessment consistency;
- Strategic mobilization of resources;

- ➤ Greater funding leverage; and
- ➤ More powerful input into creating a public voice and public will for out-of-school time issues.

There are several principles that help to describe the citywide initiative building experience. Unmistakably, building citywide initiatives requires participation from a variety of stakeholders. In order for change to occur and be sustained there needs to be broad participation from multiple sectors, i.e. schools, city, community organizations, and commitment to an agreed upon vision and the activities implemented. Building a citywide initiative is also a continuous learning process. It is not surprising to learn that in major metropolitan cities there are many complex networks of organizations and activities that hum along with little public awareness or recognition, yet hold vital relationships and collective history and provide essential services imperative to the success of a citywide initiative. Finally, it cannot be overstated how critical it is in building citywide initiatives to recognize that there is always something already in place to build upon. Though the foundation may need reinforcement, there is still something on which to base the scaffolding, and the repercussions of bypassing the existing accomplishments and experiences can be too costly in time and relationships.

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the experiences of several citywide afterschool initiatives with particular focus on the activities and strategies that contributed to building operational and sustainable citywide delivery of out-of-school time programs. The paper is intended to inform discussion, raise questions, and present recommendations for out-of-school time leaders, policy makers, and other stakeholders seeking to organize or better support citywide afterschool initiatives. The paper presents evidence of success and notes important lessons learned. It identifies key elements for building high quality citywide initiatives and explores the processes taken by afterschool leaders to get there.

The eight citywide initiatives that are profiled were chosen because they represent diverse approaches to organizing a citywide afterschool initiative. Each of the programs has a different history, both in terms of length of time in existence and choice of actions taken. They differ widely on structure, governance, mission, goals, major strategies, scope of service, roles and functions, and funding profile. With their differences and experiences they paint a comprehen-

sive picture of the variety of system building strategies and models that can be employed by emerging citywide initiatives.

Some of the cities profiled in this report have a long history in providing coordinated out-of-school time opportunities. Others are just reaching new crossroads in collaboration and organization. Information about each of the citywide initiatives was obtained through network meetings, site visits, surveys, phone calls, interviews, and publications. It is hoped that the sharing of these citywide experiences will illuminate the challenges and choices faced by leaders and policy-makers engaged in the process of building citywide initiatives, and also add to the emerging knowledge base of the afterschool field.

Denver Public Schools

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION—DENVER, COLORADO

DENVER

Total population in City: 554,636

Total population under 18: 121,766

Number of households with children: 62,842

Racial breakdown of those under 18:

- White: 48.9%
- Black or African-American: 15.0%
- Asian: 2.6%
- Native-American: 1.8%
- Hawaiian: 0.2%
- Other: 25.0%
- Two or more races: 6.5%

Percent that indicated Hispanic ethnic origin: 49.3%

Median income of households with own children: $40,909

Percent of children under 18 living in poverty: 20.8%

(Author's Note: Census information available from www.aecf.org/kidscount/census)

Profile

Denver has grown the largest segment of its before and afterschool opportunities from within the Department of Community Education of the Denver Public Schools. The mission of the Department of Community Education is to facilitate the creation and implementation of school-based services during out-of-school time in partnership with the community. The Department oversees the delivery of collaborative educational, recreational, enrichment and cultural programs for the Denver Public Schools' students, staff, families and community members. Specifically, the Community Education Office supports the following programs: Neighborhood Centers; Beacons Neighborhood Centers; Kaleidoscope Corner; Community School Classes; and 21st Century Community Learning Centers; some of these programs having a long history of providing services to the Denver Public Schools.

A formal Denver afterschool initiative began in 1990 as a middle school magnet program serving several nearby elementary schools. The program was well received and so the Community Education Office began to set up on-site programs—adding a few schools each year. In 1995 the Board of Education adopted four goals to focus the attention, energy, and resources of the district and the community on the issues of highest priority. One of the priority issues was creating school neighborhood centers. Neighborhood Centers would function as support centers for the network of individuals, agencies, and institutions committed to meeting community needs through increased resources and learning opportunities for students and families. Community Education administrators cite the process of bringing the Beacons to Denver as the catalyst in growing the afterschool movement in Denver. The organizations that came together to create and support the Beacons metamorphosed into a Citywide Task Force including community organizations, private non-profit organizations, foundations, the Mayor's Office, and the Denver Public Schools. The Department of Community Education has taken the lead in regularly convening this district out-of-school time task force. Presently,

there is a Community Education presence in over 80 schools and collaborations with many community, faith-based, or other youth development organizations to provide programming.

Key Strengths

School Commitment

One of the key strengths to Denver's success in building a citywide afterschool initiative was the willingness and commitment of the Denver Public Schools to envision school-based services during out-of-school time as one of its responsibilities. Many public school districts throughout the country have been reluctant to consider a leadership role in afterschool programming. Denver Public Schools has been the driver, fiscal agent, and facilitator of the citywide afterschool initiative. There are several significant advantages in housing the initiative administration in a department of the public schools. In Denver's case, these advantages included: (1) authority over space; (2) cost savings due to physical plant, equipment, and activity resources already in place; (3) ability to re-direct financial resources from other budgets; and (4) an already established connection with the community through the Department of Community Education.

The Department of Community Education through the Community School program had a variety of established evening and weekend classes available to all ages. The delivery of services was already oriented toward the needs of the community. In fact, there is an easy crossover between a community education model and the afterschool arena. Afterschool programs, like community education, value and model lifelong learning. The Community Education Office of a public school system would seem to be one of the most qualified departments to take on the challenge of facilitating afterschool opportunities.

Menu of Services

Another asset visible in the Denver model is the ability that the Community Education office has to package services. Dryfoos and Maguire (2002) point out that many families are discouraged from using services offered by schools or in the community because services are fragmented and loaded with bureaucratic regulations. The Denver Community Education Office is able to assemble the variety of educational and recreational opportunities offered to adults and children into an integrated menu of services. For example, at the Smiley Neighborhood Center weekday and Saturday classes are offered in Art Appreciation, JROTC, Adult Computer,

Accelerated Reader, Choosing Health, and Empowerment and Success.

Lessons Learned

When considering lessons learned program administrators caution about holding fast to initiative start-up timelines. Relentless commitment to timelines can limit dialogue and hamper moving to consensus. Within a broad coalition of leadership there is the possibility that everyone sees issues differently. One leader suggests that at times it is necessary "to move slower in order to move farther." Denver's experience confirms the importance of deeply thinking through strategies prior to implementation and considering incremental progress as the goal—focused pilot projects—rather than comprehensive radical change.

Working towards specific products/outcomes was also a successful strategy for Denver. The Out-of-School Time Task Force, which includes 25 different organizations, developed four discrete products from its work:

- Written guidelines for programs;
- Needs assessment analysis plans for two Denver neighborhoods;
- A lessons learned manual from the Beacons experience; and
- Technical assistance memorandums of understanding with community-based organizations managing the Beacons.

Afterschool leaders in Denver also learned the value of passion. The Out-of-School Time Task Force was able to hold together as a core group of stakeholders around a common mission despite the fact that a childcare tax initiative failed for two consecutive years to muster enough support from the public. Although there was wide public agreement on the need for out-of-school time programs, there was not the public support for increased dollars. Despite the disappointing climate, the Task Force maintained optimism and continued to press their agenda forward. Fortunately for Denver, in addition to the commitment of the public schools, there have been a growing number of influential voices that have taken on a new campaign of raising dollars for youth and children.

Major Challenges

As in many other citywide initiatives, a strong partnership between the city and the school district is a key implementation element. Denver will have a new mayor in the spring of 2003 and

face the challenge of maintaining a strong school/city partnership. Currently, there is strong leadership for afterschool programs at the School Board and Assistant Superintendent level. The Denver Mayor's Office has historically supported afterschool programs through its Parks and Recreation Department and has even sponsored teacher facilitated afterschool clubs at several middle schools. Afterschool leaders hope that the established partnership through the Task Force will continue.

Another challenge to Denver afterschool is to find its role in the school improvement discussion. The Denver school improvement planning process was substantially revised during the 2001-2002 school year. Several schools were required by the Colorado Department of Education to create a more substantive school improvement process and plan. These plans lay out necessary changes based on an analysis of school data including test scores (Colorado Student Assessment Program), profiles, implementation of a standards-based educational system, the DPS educational review, student and staff needs, instructional practices, parent needs, and other issues and concerns. Demonstrating impact and connection to academic improvement positions the afterschool program for priority consideration when stakeholders must make difficult financial and comprehensive school reform choices.

The After-School Corporation (TASC)

NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

NEW YORK CITY

Total population in City: 8,008,278

Total population under 18: 1,940,269

Number of households with children: 1,026,091

Racial breakdown of those under 18:

- White: 34.5%
- Black or African-American: 32.2%
- Asian: 8.8%
- Native-American: 0.8%
- Hawaiian: 0.1%
- Other: 17.8%
- Two or more races: 5.9%

Percent that indicated Hispanic ethnic origin: 34.1%

Median income of households with own children: $36,115

Percent of children under 18 living in poverty: 30.3%

Profile

The After-School Corporation (TASC) is an intermediary organization whose goal is to leverage new public and private funding, engage stakeholders, and provide the support and technical assistance necessary to build a network of high-quality, school-based, afterschool programs in New York City and other New York counties. TASC was created in 1998 with a challenge grant from George Soros's Open Society Institute (OSI), which wanted to make a significant investment in New York City. OSI saw the need for afterschool programming and pledged up to $125 million over a five-year period on the condition that matching funds were acquired from the public sector and other private donors on a three-to-one basis. In 2001, OSI extended the grant term for two additional years.

TASC supported programs are based in public schools (grades K-12) from 3:00 to 6:00 PM, Monday - Friday, during the academic year. On average about 30% of each school's students are enrolled in the afterschool program which translates to average daily attendance around two hundred to four hundred children and youth per program. TASC awards grants to community-based organizations that establish partnerships with individual public schools and then manage the programs. All of the programs are required to adhere to a basic TASC program model. TASC has significantly increased the supply of quality afterschool programming by supporting 148 programs in New York City and 57 programs elsewhere in New York State.

TASC's strategy includes:

- Creating a critical mass of afterschool programs by building a successful, high quality program model that generates public demand and political will;
- Enhancing the quality of afterschool services through training, curriculum development, and technical assistance;

- Developing public and private partnerships to sustain operation and funding of afterschool programs; and

- Serving as an intermediary among afterschool programs, funders, government, professional development agencies, and schools in order to generate and disseminate funding, to advocate for public policy and to ensure smooth running of its afterschool program operations.

While TASC is playing an important leadership role in the afterschool movement in New York City, its program model builds upon the successful practices of its more than 95 local partners many of whom have been serving children and youth in out-of-school time for years. Those partners include the Beacons, the YMCA of Greater New York, Children's Aid Society, and 36 settlement houses, along with other youth development organizations.

Key Strengths

Partnership Development

Cultivating and managing partnerships, both fiscal and programmatic, is a key strength of the TASC initiative. Every TASC afterschool site is a partnership between a community-based organization and a school. Also on the program side TASC offers support through partnerships with citywide cultural institutions. TASC informs sites of innovative visual and performing arts spaces and programs throughout New York City and assists referring and hiring arts staff. TASC also collaborates with citywide volunteer organizations, professional associations and businesses interested in lending their expertise as a resource to afterschool programs. Enhancements to sports and literacy programming are provided through a partnership with the Madison Square Garden's Cheering for Children Foundation which includes contacts with several professional sports teams and performance venues such as Radio City Music Hall. Through its partnership with AmeriCorps nearly 300 AmeriCorps members work in classrooms by helping with homework, arts projects, community service, and tutoring. TASC also collaborates with several higher education institutions to support professional development, evaluation, and improve the quality of instruction in participating afterschool programs.

TASC has been highly successful in engaging public and private funding partners. In its first four years it secured nearly $120 million in

matching funds. In addition to OSI, TASC receives funding from the New York City Department of Youth and Community Development, New York City Department of Education, state and federal funds, as well as private foundations and corporations. Because TASC's original funding was given as a challenge grant, creating financial partnerships has been crucial to TASC's sustainability. Accumulating private and foundation funding gives TASC additional leverage in soliciting more public support. Its success in building a broad and deep funding partnership has allowed it to expand the number of programs supported and to enhance capacity-building activities.

Training System

A second strength of the TASC initiative is its training component. TASC is committed to providing program staff with the necessary skills and knowledge to ensure, strengthen, and sustain the quality of afterschool programming. TASC arranges a variety of training opportunities for site coordinators and program staff and works with multiple providers to design and deliver a broad curriculum of workshops, seminars, and institutes throughout the year. The Partnership for After-School Education (PASE) and Bank Street College of Education are TASC's primary training contractors.

For afterschool program coordinators TASC offers the following:

- Pre-service training institute
- Intensive training institutes during the summer
- A technical support group for new coordinators
- Professional development workshops
- Train-the-trainer activities
- Orientation to TASC and Board of Education policies

For afterschool program staff:

- Core knowledge training that provides a foundation for developmentally appropriate practices, classroom management strategies, and conflict resolution;
- Content training that focuses on specific areas (literacy, math, science, dance, art, and sports);
- Staff development workshops;
- Site-based workshops that respond to the needs of and include key members of the school community;
- A special training module for young adults that focuses on job readiness skills, specific skills for engaging children, and group management strategies;

- CPR/First aid certification training; and
- Life-saving techniques workshop.

For afterschool coordinators and staff:

- Arts
- Parent integration and volunteer engagement
- Inclusion of special education students
- Technology integration.

TASC trainings use a variety of comprehensive strategies including teambuilding, networking, small group discussions, specific skill building, mentoring, train-the-trainer, and ongoing support. TASC supports its programs by providing training that would otherwise be outside the programs' budgets. Stipends are provided to hourly program staff that attend TASC-sponsored training events outside of normal afterschool work hours. Providing a citywide coordinated system of training allows TASC to impact and preserve program quality through training design. Program staff and leaders citywide are exposed to the same pedagogical and youth development practices. A systemic training system will give some assurance that staff carry out program goals in particular and consistent ways.

TASC's training model also recognizes that program leaders and staff in the afterschool field come to the field with different backgrounds, experiences, interests, and skills. Acknowledging the need for professional development and training at all levels of afterschool program involvement, TASC supports training for volunteers, parents, as well as school principals.

Lessons Learned

According to TASC, one of the primary lessons learned through building a citywide afterschool initiative is the importance of cultivating the support inside the school building. TASC leaders suggest that the relationship that an afterschool program forms with partners in the host school can determine the program's level of acceptance, its integration with the regular school program, and by implication, its longevity. In an evaluation of TASC conducted by Policy Studies Associates almost all site coordinators emphasized the key role that principals play in supporting afterschool programs. According to the evaluation, principals who were engaged in their school's afterschool program typically offered programming suggestions, made resources available, and helped remove barriers.

TASC has consistently emphasized to its programs the need to coordinate afterschool services with the regular school day in addition to engaging teachers from the host school to work in the afterschool program. Principals surveyed in the second evaluation of TASC reported stronger relationships with afterschool programs than were reported in year one. Despite the improvement and collaboration success, some program leaders still face situations where integration and coordination are severely limited. TASC leaders agree that fostering relationships with school principals is the first step.

Major Challenges

In the short term, TASC, like the other citywide initiatives must confront the ramifications of the contracting economy and its impact on financial resources for afterschool programs. TASC has been very successful in cultivating partnerships and will have to continue to be creative and resourceful in developing and sustaining support. Similar to other citywide initiatives, TASC is moving in a delicate balance of bringing the initiative to scale while maintaining high quality, comprehensive programming. When the initiative first began TASC needed to retain a level of control over program structure and model in order to learn what works best at what cost. As the initiative grows to scale this uniformity may not be necessary or desirable. Moving forward TASC administrators foresee integrating diverse program models while maintaining critical common features, and generally broadening its strategic vision to encompass other models that clearly contribute to and benefit the afterschool movement.

TASC has been very consistent in making the case that afterschool is an expression of the public will and represents a significant public good that should be universally available to all. TASC leaders foresee as afterschool is transformed into a public responsibility, its core functions may change as well, focusing more on safeguarding quality, conducting research, and supporting new initiatives. For now, TASC continues to manage over $80 million in funding annually and stay aggressively focused on its goals to increase the availability, quality, and sustainability of afterschool opportunities for children and youth.

San Diego "6 to 6"

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

SAN DIEGO

Total population in City: 1,223,400

Total population under 18: 293,908

Number of households with children: 150,318

Racial breakdown of those under 18:

- White: 47.8%
- Asian: 13.5%
- Black or African-American: 10.2%
- Native-American: 0.7%
- Hawaiian: 0.6%
- Other: 18.7%
- Two or more races: 8.6%

Percent that indicated Hispanic ethnic origin: 38.1%

Median income of households with own children: $46,885

Percent of children under 18 living in poverty: 20.3%

Profile

The City of San Diego has become the first major city in the United States to offer before and afterschool services in every public elementary and middle school in its jurisdiction. San Diego's "6 to 6" Extended School Day Program is a partnership between the City of San Diego's Community and Economic Development Department, the San Diego Unified School District, eight smaller districts that serve schools within the city's boundaries, and 15 local community-based organizations (CBO's). Staff employed by the city's Community and Economic Development Department manage the initiative.

In 1995 then Mayor Susan Golding convened the Safe Schools Task Force, a "collaboration of local policymakers, to develop a plan that would ensure that San Diego was poised to take a leadership role in the afterschool arena" (Ferrin & Amick, 2002). One of the goals of the Safe Schools Task Force was the creation of an extended school day program. Since September 1998 the program has evolved from the original 31 sites to now serving over 200 sites and approximately 25,000 students annually.

The City of San Diego has committed to opening community schools before and after school to provide a safe place for elementary and middle school youth to experience academic enrichment and recreation activities during the non-school hours. San Diego's "6 to 6" is designed to be an extension of the regular school day, with structured and well-supervised activities that promote enthusiasm for learning and build skills in the area of reading, writing, speech, math and science. Three organizations—Harmonium, Social Advocates for Youth (SAY), and the YMCA of San Diego County—have contracted with the City of San Diego to operate San Diego's "6 to 6" programs at the vast majority of the school sites (144 total). Twelve additional agencies have been contracted to operate the remaining programs, totaling 202 schools.

The swift growth of San Diego's "6 to 6" was financed by combining local, state, and federal resources dedicated to the expansion of afterschool programs. In addition to city funding, San Diego's "6 to 6" gathered funding from the California After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program, the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers grants, and Tobacco Settlement funds for a total annual budget of $21.5 million.

Key Strengths

Administrative Collaboration

One key strength of San Diego "6 to 6" is the administrative collaboration between the San Diego Unified School District, the eight additional school districts with which the city partners, and the sub-contracted community-based organizations that deliver the direct services at each site. San Diego Unified School District and the eight additional school districts operate under a collaborative Memorandum of Understanding that designates the City of San Diego as the fiscal and administrative agent, and the school district as the facilities and instructional agent.

The city, through its Community and Economic Development Department takes responsibility for the fiscal management, monitoring, and evaluation of the programs as well as sub-contracting direct services to CBO providers, collecting monthly reports, and preparing semi-annual reports for the State and Federal Department of Education. The districts are responsible for ensuring that adequate facility space is made available for the program, academic activities articulate with district standards, academic evaluation data is shared, daily snacks are delivered, and custodial and security services are provided. The city and the partner districts jointly share decision-making and policy formation. The administrative collaboration has been the cornerstone to San Diego's vision for providing before and afterschool services to every public elementary and middle school in the city.

Program Monitoring System

Another key strength of San Diego "6 to 6" is the program monitoring system. The city supports two staff positions dedicated to monitoring: Program Monitor and Program Analyst. One of the program monitor's primary responsibilities is to monitor sites for compliance with the contractual agreement. However, another focus of the program monitor's position is to support the training and technical assistance needs discovered through the program monitoring process. Program monitors have responsibility both for

informing providers of scheduled trainings and also tailoring future trainings to address identified program and provider needs. San Diego's "6 to 6" program monitors have delivered up to nine in-service trainings per year in addition to supporting countywide and statewide trainings. Through the trainings providers gain exposure to regional experts and have the opportunity to share "best practice."

Program Monitor/Analyst activities include:

- Reviewing monthly program reports;
- Processing and approving monthly fiscal reports and payments;
- Visiting each school site at least twice a year;
- Conducting and reviewing internal and external audits; and
- Conducting annual community, staff, parent, and principal satisfaction surveys.

Implementing a program monitoring strategy and infrastructure addresses several crucial challenges facing San Diego "6 to 6." Essentially, individual program staff straddle three centers of authority and accountability: the school, the city, and the CBO's that employ them. The program monitoring system allows for formal and clear communication between the three entities in regards to program quality and expectations. Not only is there agreement on the expectations, but there is a standard process and procedure for notification of perceived deficits and improvement planning. Of the three organizations, the city is in an advantageous position to offer an unbiased program review, i.e. the sponsoring community organization or host school may feel pressure to demonstrate positive results and understate weaknesses.

San Diego's ambition has led to a broad and complex program arena. The standardization of a program monitoring process and tools creates continuity that might not otherwise exist among programs, program providers, and school districts. Additionally, rather than just being a part of the equation as a funding source, the city serves as an invested and resourceful partner.

Each of the providers also has their own set of documented standards that often extend beyond the expectations embedded in the contractual agreement, and these agencies provide internal monitoring in addition to that provided by the city. Program leaders in San Diego had the foresight to institute a program monitoring system that could recognize the historic contributions and expertise of the community providers,

while establishing a baseline framework for quality that was acceptable to all partners. In order to genuinely achieve high program quality and quantity citywide, earnest energy and planning needed to be focused on creating the necessary accountability and assessment infrastructure.

Lessons Learned

One of the important lessons learned cited by program managers is recognizing both the limitations and strengths of the bureaucratic organization within citywide initiatives. As a large municipal organization the city of San Diego could change the landscape and existing systems to allow partnerships to develop. Community-based organizations are by nature more flexible and more action oriented than larger bureaucracies. By keeping decision-making power within the bureaucracy while giving implementation authority to the CBO's, San Diego "6 to 6" could take advantage of both organization strengths. Establishing such a symbiotic relationship doesn't come without difficulties. A successful partnership requires a certain amount of trust both offered and earned. San Diego "6 to 6" program leaders suggest that they would have never been able to expand or go to scale as they did should they not have had the level of mutuality and trust demonstrated between the city and the CBO's.

Another lesson learned shared by program administrators is the importance of including youth voices when shaping program content and delivery. There are many competing agendas in a citywide initiative—school, law enforcement, parents, city departments, etc. However, the adult leadership has not always done a good job at directly including youth and their agenda, particularly older youth. Early program data showed that "6 to 6" was not meeting attendance goals set for middle school programs. Program leaders recall that they needed to take off their "education and childcare hats" and remember who made up the middle school marketplace. In order to stimulate attendance, program leaders would need to build program content around student interests. Afterschool is not a compulsory environment. While there were benefits of participation obvious to the adults, there needed to be benefits relevant and apparent to the youth.

Major Challenges

A major challenge for "6 to 6" is data collection and creating the necessary administrative infrastructure to collect, analyze, and utilize program data. San Diego "6 to 6" is a complex and comprehensive program partnership with over 9 districts and 202 schools providing summary information. Provider agencies are paid in accordance with cumulative program attendance, so accurate and timely attendance data collection is critical (Ferrin & Amick, 2002). Over the four years, program leaders have experimented with various data collecting strategies and software systems. Ultimately, program administrators want to be able to access a daily update on enrollment characteristics and attendance. San Diego "6 to 6" is currently engaged in a process of creating infrastructure supports that will support current data collection needs such as streamlining processes and disaggregating data, along with satisfying the impending challenges associated with program expansion.

Despite its enviable accomplishments in program size, the first and foremost challenge to San Diego "6 to 6" moving forward is to expand the capacity of the program. San Diego "6 to 6" provides services to 25,000 children and youth, but there are another 50,000 waiting for the program to grow. Success has set high expectations. The city has always endeavored to bring the neediest families the greatest access, but has been limited by typical constraints such as space, personnel, funding, etc. Californians recently passed Proposition 49, the After School Education and Safety Program Act of 2002, which will direct new state funds towards afterschool and could represent an explosive jumpstart to "6 to 6" expansion. In the meantime the City of San Diego will continue to seek expansion funds from all possible public and private resources.

The Boston 2:00-to-6:00 After-School Initiative

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON

Total population in city: 589,141

Total population under 18: 116,559

Number of households with children: 61,428

Racial breakdown of those under 18:

- Black or African-American: 40%
- White: 32%
- Asian: 6.7%
- Hawaiian: 0.1%
- Other: 13.6%
- Two or more races: 6.5%

Percent that indicated Hispanic ethnic origin: 23.9%

Median income of households with own children: $36,412

Percent of children under 18 living in poverty: 25.9%

Profile

Boston Mayor Thomas M. Menino created the 2:00-to-6:00 After-School Initiative in 1998 to support the expansion of high-quality afterschool programs across the city to provide new learning and social development opportunities for children and youth. Now a division of the Boston Centers for Youth & Families (BCYF), 2:00-to-6:00 collaborates with partners in the public, private, and non-profit sectors to:

- Generate access to new resources—financial and otherwise—that enable providers to serve more young people and improve program quality;
- Strengthen the infrastructure supporting Boston's out-of-school time programs, by expanding professional development opportunities for staff; assisting organizations in capacity building, supporting improved research and data collection, and other efforts;
- Increase public understanding and support for the critical role that high-quality afterschool programs play in contributing to children's academic achievement and social development;
- Support partnerships between the Boston Public Schools (BPS) and community based organizations to strengthen connections between in-school and out-of-school learning; and
- Improve and expand the out-of-school time, youth development and sports and recreation programming of BCYF.

Afterschool programs are offered in 81 of Boston's 100 elementary and middle schools serving approximately 4,000 children. Many of these programs are managed by community-based and other youth development organizations that occupy the school building free of charge, as a result of the Mayor's commitment through the 2:00-to-6:00 initiative. Boston 2:00-to-6:00 also works with community-based providers. There are an estimated 250+ programs in Boston serving approximately 17,000-20,000 children and youth during out-of-school time.

The Boston 2:00-to-6:00 initiative supports a balanced approach to afterschool programming that incorporates youth development principles and includes academic enrichment, sports and recreation, arts, and cultural activities for children and youth. Boston 2:00-to-6:00 works in partnership with the BPS to strengthen connections between the school day and afterschool programs. The BPS recently launched its second year of free training for afterschool staff on understanding and appropriately incorporating BPS academic standards into afterschool curricula. The initiative also works to improve access to and quality of programming for children and youth with special needs.

In July 2002, Mayor Menino created the BCYF, a comprehensive reorganization that aligns City departments focused on children, youth and families. BCYF includes:

- Boston Community Centers, which provide an array of services, including afterschool programs, to Boston residents at 43 sites across the city;
- The Office of Community Partnerships, which manages grant-making to community-based organizations and engages in research and policy development around children, youth and family issues;
- The recreation unit of the Parks Department, which provides sports and fitness programs to Boston's youth; and
- The Boston 2:00-to-6:00 After-School Initiative.

The creation of BCYF enables the Mayor to put forth a unified agenda for Boston's children, youth and families, and provides Boston's families with a one-stop shop for children and youth programming and services.

Key Strengths

Readiness

In 1998, Boston was fertile ground for the development of a citywide afterschool initiative. The work of local organizations like Parents United for Child Care's (PUCC), MOST Initiative (Making the Most of Out-of-School Time), and the Massachusetts School-Age Coalition (MSAC) helped put out-of-school time on the map in Boston. MOST was a seven-year initiative funded by the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds that began in 1994 with sites in Boston, Chicago and Seattle. The goal of the initiative was to improve the quality and availability of out-of-school time programming through the creation of a sustainable citywide infrastructure.

PUCC served as the local intermediary for Boston MOST and throughout its seven years, developed an array of initiatives to expand programming, improve access for low-income children and families, improve program quality, institute professional development and networking opportunities for providers and staff, and identify sustainable sources of support. For example, the Affordability Grants Program provided resources to programs to subsidize attendance of children whose families could not afford the cost of out-of-school time care, while Facilities Grants provided resources to expand and improve the physical environment of the programs. Mayor Menino was a strong supporter of MOST and served on the MOST Advisory Board when he was a City Councilor.

While MOST laid the groundwork for Mayoral support of afterschool programming, there were three main challenges that converged in the creation of the 2:00-to-6:00 initiative: increasing demand for school-age child care brought on by welfare reform and economic realities, concerns about juvenile safety, and perhaps most importantly, the desire to take advantage of afterschool programs' potential to help children and youth meet more demanding academic standards.

High Profile Leadership

Having the Mayor at the helm of the initiative has been key to the growth and success of 2:00-to-6:00. His commitment has been critical to moving the out-of-school time advocacy and funding agenda in Boston.

In 1999, Mayor Menino and 2:00-to-6:00 convened the Task Force on After-School Time, composed of leaders of Boston's afterschool, education, business, philanthropic, and religious sectors. He gave the Task Force a charge to develop a unified vision for expanding and improving Boston's out-of-school time system. In May 2000, the Task Force released its report, "Schools Alone are Not Enough: Why Out-of-School Time is Crucial to the Success of our Children." The report included a "Call to Action" and recommendations in seven main areas:

- Increasing afterschool funding to expand affordability, availability and sustainability;
- Strengthening program quality by building strong staff capacity;
- Measuring child outcomes to improve quality and demonstrate impact;
- Building stronger connections among teachers, afterschool staff and families;
- Broadening the focus and impact of out of

school programming, including focusing on teenagers; and

- Addressing structural challenges, including facilities, transportation and licensing.

The report in calling for the formation of a funding collaborative to support afterschool programming in Boston galvanized the creation of the After-School for All Partnership. The Partnership was initiated by Mayor Menino and entrepreneur Chris Gabrieli in 2001 and includes the City, Harvard University and 12 leading foundations and corporations who together have pledged an additional $24 million in support for afterschool over five years.

In June 2002, Mayor Menino assumed the presidency of the U.S. Conference of Mayors (USCM). At the Mayor's direction, USCM applied for and received a grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation for the Mayors Afterschool Leadership Project, which will engage the leadership of America's Mayors in expanding and strengthening afterschool programs across the country.

Lessons Learned

With a small staff and budget, 2:00-to-6:00 realized the importance of creating strategic alliances with partners in the public, private, and non-profit sectors to bring resources to out-of-school time programs. Boston 2:00-to-6:00 cites partnerships as instrumental in the process of improving policy in Boston and across Massachusetts. The Expanding Youth Horizons (EYH) is one example of such a partnership. EYH, originally convened by 2:00-to-6:00 and the Children's Museum, aims to assist afterschool providers in improving the quality of the learning activities children engage in during out-of-school time. The EYH initiative has since expanded and includes providers, other cultural organizations, and the BPS as partners. Among its accomplishments are a Training and Technical Assistance Guide and two citywide conferences focused on learning in out-of-school time.

Boston 2:00-to-6:00 has also focused on larger alliances. It is participating in an effort by several statewide organizations to develop comprehensive legislation to support and improve out-of-school time programming, and to build the Massachusetts Afterschool Partnership which is a public-private collaborative focused on policy,

financing, quality improvement, and building public support for out-of-school time programming.

Major Challenges

Boston 2:00-to-6:00 leaders cite the economic downturn as the biggest challenge facing afterschool advocates in Boston. Lack of resources impacts staff training, facility improvements, transportation strategies, and efforts to lower costs for low-income families. With those considerations in mind, initiative leaders stress the importance of their role in identifying creative solutions, increasing visibility around the importance of afterschool programming, and bringing new supporters to the table who can offer resources and assistance.

St. Louis Public Schools

COMMUNITY EDUCATION INITIATIVE—ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

ST. LOUIS

Total population in City: 348,189

Total population under 18: 89,657

Number of households with children: 44,234

Racial breakdown of those under 18:

- Black or African-American: 65.8%
- White: 28.5%
- Asian: 1.5%
- Native-American: 0.3%
- Other: 1.0%
- Two or more races: 2.8%

Percent that indicated Hispanic ethnic origin: 2.3%

Median income of households with own children: $26,800

Percent of children under 18 living in poverty: 36.9%

Profile

Community Education has a long history in St. Louis. As early as 1968 Community Education Centers were operating in many of the St. Louis Public Schools (SLS). Today there are 16 comprehensive centers operating in St. Louis elementary and middle schools serving over 17,000 youth and adults. The community education initiative is managed by the school's Community Education Office and receives its primary funding from the city government and the public schools. All of the Community Education Centers have afterschool programs for youth, including tutoring and homework assistance, cultural enrichment, recreation, organized team sports, violence and drug prevention, and other activities that enhance academic achievement. The mission of the Community Education Centers is to create and support a nurturing educational environment through which children, families, and other neighborhood residents will experience success.

For the purposes of community education, the city of St. Louis is divided into 16 regions. Within each region there is a Community Education Center and a Community Education Specialist that reports to the SLS Community Education Office. The Community Education Specialist's role is to facilitate the center's connection with the community and the integration of other school communities in the region. As part of the Missouri School Improvement Program the St. Louis Public School district has adopted 15 action strategies to meet accreditation standards. Included in the action strategies is the goal to "utilize community education programs and after-school activities to promote instruction and preparation for the Missouri Assessment Program." Specifically the district's goal is to provide and assist schools to design afterschool tutorial and other academic strengthening opportunities that support MAP instruction and preparation in the Community Education Centers.

Key Strengths

Community Involvement

The involvement of community members through the Community Council at each Community Education Center is one of the strengths of the St. Louis afterschool model. The Community Council consists of local residents, parents, service providers, elected officials, local business leaders, clergy, and youth. Afterschool program leaders view the councils as central to the stability and quality of each community education site. The council partners with administration in determining programs and activities, in addition to allocating resources to support the center's objectives. Most importantly, the council links the people and organizations of the community with the school. Many of the impediments to student achievement can be addressed through the resources of the community. Providing leadership for the Community Education Centers through a Community Council focuses the agenda of the center directly on the issues and concerns that resonate in the neighborhood. Each center's Community Council also sends a representative to a combined regional council which is staffed by the Community Education Office.

Broad-Based Support

Another asset of the St. Louis afterschool model is the surrounding network of stakeholders and partnerships that are invested and energized in providing enriching out-of-school time programs for youth. St. Louis 2004, a diverse group representing major corporations, educators, non-profit organizations, and local government was created in 1996 to improve quality of life in the St. Louis region through collaborations covering a broad array of initiatives. One of the initiatives is St. Louis for Kids, which strives to ensure that every child in the St. Louis region has access to high quality out-of-school time programs in their neighborhoods. The St. Louis for Kids initiative works extensively with the Community Education Office and has developed programs benefiting over 1000 children and youth, offered training and technical assistance, distributed a written quality standards guide, and organized an annual afterschool conference and provider network.

St. Louis For Kids creates a climate that is conducive to action and support around building out-of-school opportunities for children and youth. The broad advocacy efforts and fundraising activities of the initiative keeps part of the city's vision focused on the critical needs of chil-

dren and youth which might otherwise be overshadowed by competing public interests. Such high profile support clearly is a benefit to any citywide afterschool initiative.

School Involvement

St. Louis afterschool also benefits from the school involvement in its programs. Connections between school and afterschool may be much more instinctive and fluid in the community education managed model than in models managed by third parties. One principal points out that she sees herself as both the instructional leader for the building and the facilitator of connections between all the different players in the building including extended day. This level of involvement of principals, typical in the Community Education Centers, allows center leaders to look at the whole picture of services offered during day and extended day and to decide how they want the experiences to be integrated and to bring the budget for multiple services under one umbrella.

Lessons Learned

In an overview of the extended-service schools initiative, researchers suggest that community schools are "founded on the principle that children's educational success, health and well-being cannot be separated from that of their families and other community residents" (DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, 1999). There are multiple partners necessary for a successful Community Education Center model —one essential partner being parents and representatives from the community. The role played by parents and other community members is multifaceted and significant such as providing perspective on specific services needed in the community, accounts of the struggles and strengths of their neighborhoods, and spreading the word about the Community Education Center's services and goals (Children's Aid Society, 2001). Afterschool leaders in St. Louis emphasize how important it is to the success of the Community Education Center's model of afterschool to have consistent and meaningful parent and community input.

Community education leaders in fact find that the Community Councils present unique opportunities to grow community leadership. Parents and community members are encouraged to be a part of Community Councils as a way to incubate local leadership. Council members are encouraged to move on to leadership positions in the wider public domain after service on the council.

Major Challenges

Despite its long history in providing community education opportunities, St. Louis does not have a written agreed upon set of quality standards. While there is consensus among providers and the Community Education Office on characteristics of quality programming, there remains no written document to measure quality and assure accountability. Discussion around this issue is currently taking place. There is a need for capturing in quantifiable ways what is currently being offered and at what level of quality. In general, established standards can guide the allocation of funds, promote consistency, create goals for staffing and program development, and stimulate strategic planning. Standards may provide a lens through which program providers can look critically at program components.

Moving services into the secondary schools is an additional challenge ahead for St. Louis afterschool. Many of the risk behaviors associated with out-of-school time are most prevalent in older youth. All of the Community Education Centers are located in elementary or middle schools. While there are other programs offered through community-based or youth development organizations at the high schools, many of the services centralized in a Community Education Center would have greater impact on older youth should they be more accessible. Some satellite locations have already been developed, but there is more work to be done as St. Louis continues on its goal to promote healthy, well-prepared children and youth.

San Francisco Beacon Centers

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO

Total population in City: 776,733

Total population under 18: 112,802

Number of households with children: 63,867

Racial breakdown of those under 18:

- Asian: 36.7%
- White: 30.9%
- Black or African-American: 11.8%
- Hawaiian: 1.1%
- Native-American: 0.4%
- Other: 10.9%
- Two or more races: 8.2%

Percent that indicated Hispanic ethnic origin: 22%

Median income of households with own children: $60,288

Percent of children under 18 living in poverty: 14.2%

Profile

The San Francisco Beacon Centers initiative is a pubic private partnership that supports youth and family centers in the San Francisco Public Schools. The initiative began in 1994 as a result of the collaboration of a broad-based group of San Francisco leaders led by the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund having come together to examine models of community schools. Inspired from the New York City Beacons experience, the first San Francisco Beacons opened in 1996. Currently there are eight Beacon Centers operating across San Francisco. All the centers are free and open after school, weekends, and in the summer.

The Centers are managed by community-based agencies, called lead agencies, and focus on five core program areas: education, leadership, arts and recreation, health, and career development. A Beacon Center serves as a gathering place for the community. The lead agency works with the designated school to manage and coordinate the center's operations, and partners with a number of local community and public agencies to offer the activities that occur at each center. Because of the Beacons' success they have attracted national projects such as 21st Century Community Learning Centers, AmeriCorps, America's Promise and Experience Corps to establish programs in Beacons Centers.

The Community Network for Youth Development (CNYD) serves as the technical assistant to the Beacons Initiative and provides management, training, coordination and facilitation to assist the Beacon Centers to achieve their objectives. CNYD is an independent nonprofit agency with 501(c)3 status and works as an intermediary organization to strengthen the field of youth development in the Bay Area. There are three areas of responsibility for CNYD related to the Beacon Centers initiative:

- Assessing capacity, resources and needs;
- Arranging customized technical assistance; and

➤ Partnering with sites to assess progress in meeting goals.

The Beacon Centers initiative is led by a Steering Committee which includes representation from the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund; the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF); the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD); and the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department with staffing assistance provided by CNYD. The Steering Committee sets policy and guides the overall direction of the Beacon Initiative.

Key Strengths

Funding Partnership

Two components of the Beacon Centers initiative that have contributed to its sustainability and program success are the funding partnership and the theory of change. Each of these organization infrastructure elements has positioned the centers to successfully manage a wide variety of programs, increase youth participation, and dedicate their energy towards permanent change in the city.

The Haas, Jr. Fund initiated a funding partnership for the Beacons in San Francisco and continues to invest in the supports that promote long lasting impacts on youth. Sixteen foundations under the leadership of Haas, Jr. provide capacity-building grants to Beacon centers; 15 % of core operating budgets (each Beacon has a core operating budget of up to $350,000 annually); and finance the intermediary, public support campaign, and evaluation. Resources from the donors are pooled, giving the steering committee flexibility in deciding how to spend the funds. The San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and their Families provides 85% of core dollars, primarily from the Children's Fund, a voter-approved initiative that sets aside a portion of tax revenues for children's services.

A funder, as lead organization in a citywide afterschool initiative, may occupy a particularly advantageous position for carrying out the necessary tasks of supporting and sustaining the initiative. The San Francisco Beacons serves as a promising model for creating infrastructure to support financing and sustainability, by positioning the funder to lead.

Building this infrastructure has the following advantages:

➤ The funding is driven by a compelling policy and program agenda. Funding an initiative such as the Beacons is central to Haas, Jr.

Fund's mission and that of other members of the Beacon Steering Committee. Where there is high compatibility between the program agenda and the funder's mission, the funder/program relationship may be much more secure and not subject to the same re-negotiation that more loosely connected relationships may be.

- Having the funder in a leadership role can make use of the funder's historic experience in funding similar initiatives, knowing the life cycle of an initiative and the costs and expenditures associated.

- Funders in leadership roles are likely to act in ways that protect their investments. The Beacon Steering Committee contracts with the Community Network for Youth Development to provide technical and overarching management assistance to the Beacon sites. CNYD facilitates the work of the Beacon Steering Committee; manages the day-to-day operations of the initiative; supports fund raising and promotion of the initiative; and coordinates the evaluation process. The decision to contract an intermediary such as CNYD ensures the integrity of the program and the accountability to the guiding principles and mission.

- Because of their financial position and connection to similar industry partners, funders have the attention of the people who can make things happen. They have a convening presence and experience at galvanizing support. While the amount of contributions from foundations vary, there is the advantage of broad-based support and diverse organizational strengths:

  - Funders have flexibility in organizing strategies to leverage new funds for programs. Promoting and facilitating matching funding strategies can open up new resources and broaden commitment.

  - One foundation's emphasis on a particular issue can often influence the participation of other public or private entities.

Planning and Improvement Strategy

An equally vital component has been the institutionalization of a "theory of change" process by the Beacon sites. The theory of change logic model helps programs identify the vision and rationale behind their program and build consensus on the program's design and operations (Harvard Family Research Project, 2000). The measurement focus is on desired outcomes. The Beacon Centers' theory of change outlines early,

intermediate, and long-term outcomes. By focusing on outcomes the programs are regularly engaged in assessing the results of their programs for participants and using that analysis to improve the quality of their program inputs.

With technical assistance and support from CNYD, Beacon Centers build from early outcomes such as community engagement, center visibility, diverse and well trained staff, to youth's increased competencies in core development areas, increased family support for education, community ownership of the Beacon, and broader and deeper school/community collaboration. Beacon Centers reach their long-term outcomes only if their early and intermediate outcomes have been met. What CNYD has found is that the theory of change, in addition to outlining responsibilities, has become the most important tool for management, planning, and implementation (Eldridge, Piha, & Levin, 2002).

Utilization of the theory of change process affords the following:

- Serves as a critical tool for the programs to manage their unfolding;
- Is useful to reflect on the progress made in the past year;
- Encourages program leaders to approach what they do as a work in progress; and
- Keeps funders' expectations real.

Lessons Learned

There are several helpful insights that come out of the San Francisco Beacon experiences. CNYD's role as an intermediary has been crucial to the Beacon's success. The Beacon Steering Committee solicited CNYD's participation because they recognized the need for a strong technical assistance team, knew CNYD's history in youth development capacity building, and wanted a management entity that was not going to be directly of the public sector or the private sector.

The intermediary model as structured between CNYD and the San Francisco Beacons afforded several advantages. By anchoring the Beacons mission in CNYD the mission was firmly planted in youth development and less subject to mission drift due to mayoral changes, school administration shifts, etc. The Beacons were comfortably distanced from municipal or school sub-agendas. The intermediary was also in a position to marshal influence from different sectors and could serve as a communication bridge between diverse stakeholders.

CNYD's experience in providing youth development and training also provided a valuable link to research and literature on youth development practice, which would be an invaluable resource in building the Beacons. This was an organization already committed to translating research into practice. Utilizing an intermediary as a management structure also gave the Beacons an enhanced funding opportunity. The intermediary was free from some constraints that may hinder school or municipal efforts to seek or solicit funding. What came together around the Beacons project was a large number of system level stakeholders. In that climate, turning to an intermediary for neutral leadership and the ability to bridge the divide between system stakeholders and program implementation seemed to be a solid choice.

A second insight from the San Francisco Beacons experience is the value of building on the knowledge and resources of others. Representatives from various foundations had come together in San Francisco with a vision to transform public schools in low-income neighborhoods into youth and family centers. The Beacon model already had been implemented and successful in New York and so in 1994 program officers from three of the foundations traveled to New York City to learn and observe. The vision and many of the conditions in San Francisco resembled the circumstances surrounding the Beacon Centers development in New York City. San Francisco's Beacon initiative moved more quickly by adapting New York's approach then if they had created something entirely new on their own (Eldredge, Piha, & Levin, 2002).

Major Challenges

From the perspective of the Beacon's Steering Committee the major challenge for the Beacons moving forward is crafting the necessary leadership for long-term sustainability. What should the executive function of the Beacons look like? In 1998 the Beacons Steering Committee created a sustainability sub-committee that has since explored the issues of responsibilities and roles, accountability, and long-term outcomes. As the sites have matured there is growing consensus that the initiative would like to move to a more shared governance approach with greater management responsibility handled by the individual sites. CNYD has been actively developing technical assistance tools that examine program and organization quality. Having been grounded in a

strong theory of change process and supported by a stellar public/private financing partnership, the Beacons have already achieved a great deal and should be on a solid foundation from which to grow more independent.

Beyond the Bell

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES

Total population in City: 3,694,820

Total population under 18: 981,311

Number of households with children: 478,946

Racial breakdown of those under 18:

- White: 39.3%
- Black or African-American: 11.5%
- Asian: 6.8%
- Native-American: 1.0%
- Hawaiian: 0.2%
- Other: 34.8%
- Two or more races: 6.5%

Percent that indicated Hispanic ethnic origin: 62.1%

Median income of households with own children: $33,050

Percent of children under 18 living in poverty: 30.7%

Profile

In October 2000, the Los Angeles City Board of Education directed the Superintendent of Schools to develop a comprehensive strategy to ensure that all families and children have access to quality after-school programs that provide a safe, secure environment for extended learning and enrichment activities, and to achieve this goal in every elementary and middle school by 2006. Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) has a total K-12 enrollment of 736,675 students and over 550 schools. The implementation challenge of such a proposal was overwhelming.

In an effort to meet the mandate, the LAUSD created Beyond the Bell Branch. The Branch staff met and worked with many segments of the Los Angeles community to seek information, input, ideas, concerns, and specifically to identify critical components and issues that had to be addressed to ensure quality programs district-wide. There were many out-of-school time programs already providing services in the district, although the numbers were drastically insufficient to meet the needs of families. Beyond the Bell created a five-phase blueprint for success, which began with realignment and augmentation of existing out-of-school programs. In addition, Beyond the Bell expanded its role at each campus by providing the resources for Out-of-School Programs Managers, and adding before school, enrichment program, and academic/tutorial components while continuing to build partnerships with CBOs, foundations, and local agencies. Beyond the Bell became a state approved supplemental service provider which increased its responsibility to provide extra academic support opportunities to students.

The following is a list of the programs involved in carrying out the Beyond the Bell afterschool strategy:

LA's BEST

Afterschool enrichment and recreation program for elementary school children.

YS Cares

Comprehensive afterschool program including child care, academic assistance, recreation, and enrichment offered for grades 1-5.

LA Bridges

Gang prevention and early intervention program through a partnership between L.A. City and LAUSD.

KidCare

Intellectual, creative, social, and recreational program offered at elementary schools.

Academic Mentor Program

Mentoring program offered in 15 elementary schools and one middle school.

After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Programs

Afterschool programs operated by community-based organizations in elementary and middle schools.

Outdoor Education Program

Two outdoor discovery, exploration and observation program sites for upper elementary and secondary students.

Youth Services After School Playground and Summer Program

Recreation and enrichment activities for elementary and middle school students offered during the summer.

21st Century Community Learning Centers

Federally-funded partnership between schools and communities offering before and afterschool as well as Saturday programs for students and parents at elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools.

Extended Learning Programs

Intervention program with intense instruction for grades K,1,2,3,6, and 8.

Youth Services After School Playgrounds Programs

Afterschool supervised playground program at 514 elementary and middle schools.

Cleary, Beyond the Bell covers a large part of the public afterschool program arena in Los Angeles. There are major challenges to unifying all of the smaller and diverse initiatives under the umbrella of Beyond the Bell. Several key strengths of the initiative have positioned Beyond the Bell to move successfully towards its five-year implementation goals.

Key Strengths

High Level Administrator

At the time of creation of Beyond the Bell the Superintendent created an Assistant Superintendent position to oversee implementation. The appointment of such a high position in the administration is a key strength of the initiative. The creation of such a high level position to oversee the roll-out of afterschool programs throughout the system had both symbolic and practical significance. Symbolic because the school system by making a high level appointment was clearly sending the message that afterschool care was a priority for the system. On the practical side, locating decision-making power and administration at a high level gave a particular access to resources and leveraging ability to those in charge. Additionally, locating the administration of the initiative within the LAUSD allowed for the following advantages:

- LASUD had ready access to afterschool users;
- LAUSD had the facilities available;
- LAUSD can use its status as a large organization to give voice and advocacy to the concerns of youth and families; and
- LAUSD offers the potential of multiple connections through staff and other program resources.

On the downside, schools have a tendency to measure the program by academic/school success standards and can suffer extensive program cuts in difficult budget times. Beyond the Bell has attempted to balance these challenges by developing its own quality improvement review standards and pressing the afterschool agenda to be central to the mission of the district.

Program Diversity

Another key strength of the Beyond the Bell initiative is the variety, history, and quality of programs included. The Youth Services program began as early as 1945, receiving funding from the community tax. There were a variety of enrichment activities, which were then cut under Proposition 13, leaving the program to be primarily recreational. That history though does reflect the school district's longstanding experience and success at providing supervised social and physical activities after school.

Additionally, Beyond the Bell includes the nationally recognized flagship program, LA's BEST. Since the program's inception in 1988, LA's BEST has proven itself as a sustainable and results driven afterschool program. Throughout its 14 years LA's BEST has maintained a solid municipal partnership. This partnership has allowed greater access to resources and a

foothold into city politics and the city agenda. LA's BEST currently serves more than 18,000 students in 104 elementary schools across the City of Los Angeles. LA's BEST has strengthened its position by promulgating accountability evidence with which politicians and policy makers can align. By becoming the "city's brag" LA's BEST has been able to cultivate support at all layers of political representation. The frequent all program/all citywide events not only unite the participants and families, but present opportunities for stakeholders and policymakers to show public support of the general afterschool vision for Los Angeles. Beyond the Bell has certainly been advantaged and strengthened by incorporating LA's BEST under its umbrella of services.

Lessons Learned

One important realization of the administration of the Beyond the Bell initiative was its need to be as inclusive as possible when organizing service delivery. By building on the services of community-based, municipal, and private organizations already in place, particularly LA's BEST, Beyond the Bell was able to benefit from the other organizations' strengths along with gaining a strong advocate in the Mayor's Office.

Beyond the Bell administrators also found that the more inclusive their decision making and activities, the less barriers they faced. Their partnership activities and strategies have been very successful leading to collaboration with over 100 community and municipal programs.

Another vital lesson learned was the importance of gaining credibility. It is tempting to overstate activity and accomplishments when public image can have tremendous effect on program continuation, financial support, etc. Beyond the Bell administrators concur on the importance of "being what you say you are going to be." The LAUSD out-of-school time program evaluation process is used to present a realistic picture of the assets and liabilities of each individual program in addition to establishing training and equipment needs, etc. The five-year written plan presented to the school board was detailed and comprehensive. The Beyond the Bell administration goal was to provide a realistic blueprint that, if followed, ensured not only quality programs in all elementary and middle schools but would also provide an infrastructure that ensured coordination, supervision, evaluation, and efficient use of resources.

Major Challenges

As Beyond the Bell continues on its course toward implementing its five-year goals there are several major challenges ahead. The first challenge is to remain on the agenda of key policy makers including school, city, and corporate leadership. Not only is it necessary to stay on the agenda, but to tie in Beyond the Bell's mission with the missions of these other organizations and stakeholders. Transparent and inclusive decision making along with public events and a strong public image campaign are a major strategy.

Like other communities, sustainability for Beyond the Bell revolves greatly around funding. California voters just passed Proposition 49, the After School Education and Safety Program Act of 2002 by a wide margin. The act will provide grants to elementary and middle schools in California for afterschool programs. The grants are open to all schools and not targeted towards specific types of schools. Schools will be required to provide a 50% match to all state funding. Beyond the Bell was a strong voice advocating passage of the proposition. Grants will not be made until the economy improves sufficiently to provide the state with enough revenue to fund the program. In the meantime Beyond the Bell will look for continued support within the LAUSD budget expecting that school, city, and corporate leadership will continue to prioritize its funding as it endeavors to bring a sense of vision, planning, and coordination for all out-of-school time programs in LAUSD.

Project Lift-Off

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

SEATTLE

Total population in City: 87,827

Total population under 18: 87,827

Number of households with children: 50,783

Racial breakdown of those under 18:

- White: 53.9%
- Black or African-American: 14.2%
- Asian: 15.5%
- Native American: 1.2%
- Hawaiian: 0.9%
- Other: 4.0%
- Two or more races: 10.3%

Percent that indicated Hispanic ethnic origin: 8.8%

Median income of households with own children: $60,414

Percent of children under 18 living in poverty: 14.5%

Profile

Project Lift-Off began in late 1998 in an effort to create effective and affordable early learning and out-of-school-time opportunities for Seattle children and youth. The initiative has now grown to include Seattle and King County, which together encompass 19 school districts and 2,134 square miles spanning major metropolitan areas, suburban jurisdictions, and remote rural areas.

Project Lift-Off is a key way people and organizations across Seattle and King County come together to ensure that all children have an equal chance to succeed. Lift-Off employs a community partnership model in which more than 40 business and community leaders, grant makers, nonprofit and community organizations, school districts, governments, parents and faith-based groups work on projects together from their existing roles and agencies. The City of Seattle funds Project Lift-Off's core project management, including two paid staff who coordinate and administer the project. Lift-Off's structure includes the following:

- Partnership Group—sets Lift-Off's overall policy direction, adopts and amends project work plans, and oversees the "Blueprint for Change" strategies and the work of Project Lift-Off Lead Executive. The Partnership Group meets quarterly.
- Steering Committee—a committee of the Partnership Group, oversees the implementation of the Partnership Group's policies and decisions, and provides advice and direction to the Lift-Off Lead Executive. The Steering Committee meets monthly or as needed.
- Action Teams—plan and implement Lift-Off's work. Each self-directed team is convened by one or more Lift-Off partners who bring together the staffing capacity, stakeholders, and expertise needed to implement the strategy. The Action Teams set overall outcomes for their work, along with three-year and one-year outcomes.

- Lead Executive and the Project Lift-Off Center—form the core of Lift-Off's leadership and organizational support. Currently, Cedar River Group is under contract to provide the Lift-Off Center, and provides a Lead Executive.

The Project Lift-Off Partnership Group chose the following three key objective program areas in April 2002.

1) School readiness: Getting School Ready aims to develop school readiness guidelines, together with resources and an outreach campaign to mobilize and educate parents, caregivers, early childhood educators, kindergarten teachers and schools. The project has held 41 community conversations about school readiness in 17 of King County's 19 school districts. The project is now developing school readiness resources and strategies for parents, caregivers, early educators, teachers and schools. The project will distribute these materials in 2003.

2) Community Learning Centers and alignment: Community Learning Centers (CLCs) at public schools offer a rich array of out-of-school time programs for students and their families, serving as community hubs for life-long learning. Last year's 10 CLCs served 2,310 children and youth, and their families. In 2002/03 there are 15 CLCs in Seattle elementary and middle schools and a K-8 school. The Seattle Alignment Initiative is an effort to align out-of-school time programs with student learning standards in partnership with schools. The school-provider teams develop an alignment plan to support learning, and the provider receives a rent-free lease with the school district. There are 70 school-provider teams in Seattle, serving 3,500 children.

3) Finance and quality improvements: The Northwest Finance Circle is one of four sites in a national demonstration project to improve financing for early education and out-of-school time programs (birth to 12). One Finance Circle strategy piloted this year helped the families of 32 children gain better access to financial aid. Champions for Children is a public/private partnership working to improve children's success in school and in life. It is now assisting 14 child care programs serving 925 children to achieve national accreditation, and is working to increase the public's awareness about the importance of quality in child care and out-of-

school time programs. TEACH provides scholarships, paid release time and salary enhancements for child chare teachers to attend college courses in early education. Sixty-five teachers working at 55 different providers in Seattle are participating.

Key Strengths

Community Partnership Model

Lift-Off uses a community partnership model in which strong buy-in from local elected officials is combined with support from a broad base of community organizations and businesses. A key to success in the beginning was the personal involvement of leaders such as the mayor, school superintendent, chamber of commerce, representatives from large corporations such as the Boeing Company, and community organizations such as School's Out Washington.

A significant outgrowth of this buy-in is the Project Lift-Off Opportunity Fund. This is a unique partnership of 22 private grant makers and two governments (City of Seattle and King County) who come together to make strategic investments. The Opportunity Fund seeks to expand and create (a) early learning opportunities including pre-school and child care programs; (b) after-school learning activities and programs; and (c) youth development, recreation and leadership opportunities. The Opportunity Fund partners make decisions on the direction of the Fund's work.

Since January 2001, funders have invested more than $1.75 million through the Fund, and private funders have made $4.2 million in aligned grants to 125 non-profits. The first pooled fund grants, announced in early 2002, provided $300,000 to six non-profits for education and support programs for family-friend-and-neighbor caregivers.

Community Needs Assessment

With initial funding from the City of Seattle, Project Lift-Off conducted a needs assessment to uncover gaps in service and to determine community needs. The assessment was coordinated through a collaboration between business leaders, a consultant polling firm, School's Out Washington (long-standing training and advocacy organization), and Child Care Resources (the local resource and referral agency).

Using the information gathered in the needs assessment, Project Lift-Off met with community

members to determine if data matched community members' experiences and to solicit their ideas. The community process included five neighborhood meetings, six youth forums, and six meetings for hard-to-reach and non-English speaking communities.

Through the community meetings and other smaller group meetings, the initiative was able to engage more than 1000 members of the community. In addition, Lift-Off conducted two phone surveys, one with youth and another with parents, to further identify needs and gaps.

It was clear from the community process that helping children and youth was a high priority for residents and that communities wanted real change that was countywide. Project Lift-Off's action plan, crafted in response to the needs assessment and community process, is called the "Blueprint for Change" and charges the community to:

- Revolutionize the system of financing early education and after-school programs;
- Invest in the early years, birth to five, and boost the quality of programs and activities for children;
- Develop more and better choices for children, youth and families in schools and neighborhoods;
- Inspire youth leadership and engagement; and
- Lead the nation in family-friendly workplaces.

Lessons Learned

Despite lack of universal support for conducting what was viewed as another community needs assessment, this assessment was an important first step. School's Out Washington, which for years has promoted the out-of-school time agenda in Seattle and King County, had previously conducted several community needs assessments. The new data convinced people to come to the table and the assessments helped to mobilize support on the grassroots level.

It also became clear that the need for high-quality early education and out-of-school time programs does not stop at jurisdictional boundaries. So while City of Seattle support was crucial to launching Project Lift-Off and for continuing to support the initiative's coordination, it was also crucial for Lift-Off to expand and involve leadership from across the county.

Major Challenges

Project Lift-Off relies on the commitment of the partnership in order to move its agenda forward. Many partners have commented that Lift-Off's strength is that it brings stakeholders together to work across disciplines and jurisdictions. However, during the current economic downturn, the work of the partnership is strained as partners focus more closely on their own organizations' core missions and limit "extra" meetings and activities for staff. This is requiring Lift-Off to adjust its goals and strategies to meet current challenges.

Project Lift-Off leaders report that having the agenda come from the community action teams rather than from the "top down" has given ownership and authority to the agencies that are implementing the projects. The challenge is to both celebrate the agencies that are implementing the projects and identify Project Lift-Off with the action teams' results.

Framing the Issues

Each of the citywide initiatives profiled in this paper has faced similar challenges of determining governance, defining goals, maintaining quality and scaling up, and planning for sustainability. These and other challenges have been illuminated through other research and work such as the MOST (Making the MOST of Out-of-School Time) Initiative launched in 1994. MOST was a systems-building approach to improving the quality and availability of programming for children and youth in Boston, Seattle, and Chicago utilizing governance, linkage, leveraging, and advocacy strategies.

Research by the Forum for Youth Investment (FYI) also provides a framework for thinking about these and other challenges faced by cities building out-of-school time systems: (1) quality and continuity of programs; (2) sufficient capacity and resources; and (3) a climate that supports action and investment. The first challenge involves creating a strong base of programs with high quality learning opportunities. The second challenge is ensuring that adequate resources and investments in capacity, including human, organizational, and physical infrastructure are made in order to support quality programming. The third challenge entails creating a supportive climate for action—the leadership, accountability, and vision that make investments possible (FYI, 2002). This framework is very useful for looking collectively at the accomplishments and strengths of the eight citywide initiatives profiled in this paper. Rather than considering the framework as a continuum, if we imagine the challenges as interdependent, that each of the challenges need to be worked on simultaneously and continuously build on one another, then we can see where key activities undertaken by initiatives fit in to the larger goal of creating high quality supports and opportunities for young people.

Quality and Continuity of Programs

Quality speaks to the ability of programs to deliver particular developmental inputs which result in positive outcomes for participants (FYI, 2002). Part of building quality is knowing quality. Before embarking on its journey of creating afterschool programs, TASC leaders were very careful to recognize and incorporate the positive experiences of several organizations that historically provided out-of-school time opportunities to children and youth in New York City. TASC also developed a particular model for programming which has helped it retain a level of quality con-

trol. Similarly, Beyond the Bell in Los Angeles, looked to its Youth Services program begun in 1945 to anchor its reconstituted and expanded model for afterschool programming. In fact most of the initiatives profiled contract with local CBOs to manage programs thereby taking advantage of many CBO's longevity and expertise in youth development practices.

Several different approaches have been taken to sustain quality. The Denver Task Force developed two products related to quality assurance—written guidelines for programs and a lessons learned manual from the Beacons. Beyond the Bell has been engaged in discussion around developing a set of citywide program standards. The San Francisco Beacons, with guidance from CNYD, institutionalized a "theory of change" process which promotes regular engagement in program analysis and uses results to improve the quality of program inputs.

Continuity involves linking children and youth in afterschool programs to the range of other supports and opportunities available through the broader resources of the community. The citywide afterschool initiatives supported through community education departments such as in St. Louis and Denver are examples of this outreach. Neighborhood Centers in Denver and Community Learning Centers in St. Louis function as support centers providing access to the network of individuals, agencies, and institutions that can collectively address the needs of the community. In the same way, the San Francisco Beacons serve as gathering places for the entire community, and provide a continuum of support across a range of needs—health, recreation, adult education—not just limited to afterschool programming for a select age of youth.

Breadth of partnerships also provides a level of continuity. Beyond the Bell has a role in over 500 elementary and middle schools involving partnerships with multiple community and youth serving organizations. Through all of these possible connections Beyond the Bell has a recurring presence in many youth's lives. Project Lift-Off has breadth at the organization level. More than 40 business and community leaders, grant makers, nonprofit and community organizations, school districts, governments, parents and faith-based groups make up the project's Partnership Group, providing rich opportunity for connections across organizations serving the same youth and families.

Sufficient Capacity and Resources

In order to support high quality programming sufficient investment in capacity is required. Building capacity for citywide initiatives includes building a well-trained, stable workforce, promoting standards, and strong organization management.

San Diego "6 to 6" uses its program monitoring system to support training and technical assistance. Trainings are tailored to the program and provider needs as illuminated during the monitoring process. TASC works with multiple providers to deliver a full curriculum of trainings specifically designed for different levels of staff. Expanding Youth Horizons, one of Boston's 2:00-to-6:00 partnerships, produced a catalog of citywide training and technical assistance opportunities. Many of the citywide initiatives have implemented comprehensive plans to support the professional development of out-of-school time and youth development staff. These plans have been undertaken with the realization that stable staff, continuity in caring adult relationships, and quality program inputs are essential for creating and sustaining meaningful youth experiences.

All of the citywide initiatives distinguish certain models for programming/program structure, some to a greater degree than others. These models might incorporate the National School-Age Care Alliance standards or others crafted through task forces, school/city collaborations, etc. San Diego "6 to 6" establishes a baseline of program requirements through its contractual agreement with the provider agencies. The Community Councils at each Community Learning Center in St. Louis have input into program and resource decisions, as do school principals. In Denver and in Los Angeles, citywide discussions have taken place with the vision to create citywide standards and outcome goals. Establishing citywide standards can guide the allocation of funds, promote consistency, create goals for staffing and program development, and stimulate strategic planning. It is a critical step towards sustaining high quality programs.

Of the eight citywide initiatives profiled three are administered through an office of the school department (Denver Community Education, St. Louis Community Education, and Beyond the Bell). Boston 2:00-to-6:00, San Diego "6 to 6," and Project Lift-Off are administered through municipal offices. The remaining two, TASC and the San Francisco Beacons, are administered

through a capacity building intermediary or self-standing organization. TASC administers its own programs and the Beacons Steering Committee with assistance from CNYD administers the San Francisco Beacons. As discussed in several profiles, there are advantages and disadvantages to each governing model. What does seem critical whichever model is chosen, is that the governance structure be a magnet for collaboration. Citywide initiative leaders over and over again point to the necessity and value of partnership—to accomplish tasks, broaden support, and to increase and sustain resources.

Resource challenges at the city level involve support for staff development and training, facilities enhancement, program expansion, transportation and access, governance, and financial stability. There have been profound efforts on the part of afterschool leaders in these eight profiled initiatives to secure the future of afterschool opportunities in their cities. Boston 2:00-to-6:00, TASC, San Francisco Beacons, and Project Lift-Off have all played a role in developing substantial public and private financial partnerships to support the development and continuation of out-of-school time opportunities. Other initiatives including Beyond the Bell, St. Louis Community Education, San Diego "6 to 6," and Denver Community Education have made the case for continued support from the public school system or municipal budget.

Climate That Supports Action and Investment

A climate that supports action and investment is stimulated by sustained demand, strong leadership, accountability systems, and a shared vision of success (FYI, 2002). Project Lift-Off conducted a community-wide needs assessment to uncover gaps in service and to determine community needs. Follow-up included community meetings, youth forums, and phone surveys. Through this work, Project Lift-Off was able to engage a critical mass of youth and families to begin mobilizing support for real change. Rousing vocal demand and increasing public awareness of the need for afterschool opportunities is key. Even more important is capturing it in numbers and stories.

Securing the support of a strong and vocal leader can significantly impact the success of a citywide afterschool initiative. Mayor Menino in Boston and Mayor Golding in San Diego played critical roles in prioritizing afterschool opportunities on

the city agenda. High level leadership within school administration, as in Beyond the Bell, creates new avenues for advocacy and connections that otherwise may be inaccessible.

A handful of the initiatives including the Beacons, TASC, and San Diego "6 to 6" have implemented evaluation structures/processes, including independent evaluators to benchmark development. Data is collected on operations, enrollment, participation, curriculum and activities, staffing, and the impact on youth outcomes. The results are overwhelmingly positive. The value of such information can be immeasurable—as it is publicly disseminated to build support for the initiative's mission.

Lastly, all of the eight initiatives began with a vision. For some like TASC and the San Francisco Beacons the vision was gifted from a caring foundation or collaboration of individuals seeking to make a difference. Other visions were given by municipal leaders or by direct charge from school administration as in Beyond the Bell and St. Louis Community Education. The origin of the vision is less important as is how it was nurtured. Of all the lessons learned cited in this paper, perhaps the most salient, and in fact one that resonates through every citywide story is that of Denver Community Education and the value of passion. Despite enormous work in program planning, policy development, and capacity building there may still be no more critical element to moving the out-of-school time agenda forward than passion for the vision. Leaders in all the initiatives, as in Denver, have remained passionate about their vision to provide positive supports and opportunities in out-of-school time to their city's children and youth despite numerous setbacks—and that has afforded them a much-improved position to face the many challenges ahead.

Notes

Dewitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. (1999, January). *An overview of the extended-service schools initiative.* New York, NY: Author.

Dryfoos, J., & Maguire, S. (2002). *Inside full-service community schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Eldridge, S., Piha, S., & Levin, J. (2002). Building the San Francisco Beacons. *New Directions For Youth Development, 94,* 89-108.

Ferrin, D., & Amick, S. (2002). San Diego's 6 to 6: A community's commitment to out-of-school time. *New Directions For Youth Development, 94,* 109-117.

Forum for Youth Investment. (2002). *Learning opportunities for children and youth: Expanding commitments.* Takoma Park, MD: Author.

Harvard Family Research Project. (2001). *Learning from logic models in out-of-school time.* Cambridge, MA: Author.

Massachusetts 2020 and Mass Insight Education. (2002). *Schools alone are not enough: How after-school and summer programs help raise student achievement.* Boston, MA: Author.

The Children's Aid Society. (2002). *Building a community school* (p.65). New York, NY: Author.

U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey (NHES). (1999). Available: http://nces.ed.gov

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1997). *Welfare reform and child care supply.* (1997). (Report No. HEHS-97-95). Available: http://www.access.gpo.gov

Appendix A

THE CROSS-CITIES NETWORK FOR LEADERS OF CITYWIDE AFTERSCHOOL INITIATIVES

THANK YOU

The authors wish to thank the members of the Cross-Cities Network and their colleagues for providing interviews, written reports, and other materials to support the writing of this paper.

This paper highlights experiences of member cities of the Cross-Cities Network Project, which has been managed from July 2000 to June 2002 by the National Institute on Out-of-School Time (NIOST) at the Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College. The Cross-Cities Network brought together leaders from citywide afterschool initiatives representing 21 major cities across the United States.

The three primary goals of the project were to: (1) increase the capacity and knowledge of high-level leaders; (2) improve the effectiveness of citywide afterschool initiatives; and (3) contribute to the development of a coherent vision for the field at the national level.

The project was funded by the Carnegie Corporation with additional support from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Over the course of the two years of the project NIOST convened meetings, provided training and technical assistance, prepared topical briefs, facilitated an e-groups communication stream, and produced meeting notebooks.

Appendix B

ELEMENTS FOR BUILDING CITYWIDE AFTERSCHOOL INITIATIVES

NOTE

It is important to remember that although the process is linear on paper, each user will need to modify the sequence or application of elements to meet initiative, stakeholder, or community needs.

1 Start with a Vision

- Involve parents
- Involve community
- Convene stakeholders
- Build consensus
- Create a process
- Develop an approach and a philosophy
- Build collaboration at a systems level
- Negotiate turf issues upfront
- Develop a clear mission
- Develop a plan for leadership
- Create a leadership team

2 Assess Needs, Barriers, Resources, and Assets

- Collect data on needs, barriers
- Collect data on supply, resources, assets
- Collect data on public opinion
- Organize information and message based on assessment
- Discuss results with community
- Manage outside consultants

3 Plan Initiative: Structure and Content

- Increase public awareness
- Sell action agenda
- Plan management structures and systems
- Plan quality and accountability systems
- Develop model
- Build collaboration at systems level
- Build strategic partnerships
- Consider sustainability strategies

4 Implement the Plan

- ➤ Attention to Systems
  - Build collaboration at all levels
  - Develop innovative partners
  - Change underlying systems
  - Increase communications
  - Develop and monitor information systems
  - Influence public policy

- ➤ Attention to Community-Building
  - Connect previously unengaged stakeholders
  - Reach out to underserved populations
  - Create structures for community engagement and decision making
  - Conduct public awareness campaign

- ➤ Attention to Capacity-Building
  - Leverage new funding
  - Distribute funds
  - Coordinate funding
  - Provide or coordinate training
  - Provide or coordinate technical assistance
  - Develop and monitor accountability systems
  - Develop and monitor administrative systems

- ➤ Attention to Evaluation
  - Create and sustain informal evaluation models
  - Create and sustain formal evaluation models

5 Disseminate

- ➤ Communicate approach to those outside of the city/initiative
- ➤ Disseminate approach for adaptation in other cities
- ➤ Advocate for increased support
- ➤ Influence public policy

Appendix C

DATA TABLE OF CROSS-CITIES NETWORK INITIATIVES

	Year Initiative Began	Type of Lead Organization	Does the Initiative Provide Direct Programming?	Level of Funding	Revenue Sources
Atlanta **United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta** Laureen Lamb, Strategy Director, Community Investment Afterschool/Youth Development, llamb@unitedwayatl.org	2000	Capacity-Building Intermediary/ Community Mobilizing Organization	Yes	$15M	United Way Employee Champion Drive; Individual donors; Private Foundations
Baltimore **Baltimore's After-School Strategy** **The After School Institute** Rebkha Atnafou, Director, ratnafou@afterschoolinstitute.org	1998	Partnership of non-profit & quasi city government agency	No	$29M	DHHS-TANF; DOE-21st CCLC; Dept. Agri-CACFP-School Lunch Program, State-Grants for After School Programming; Local-Parks and Recreation; Mayor's Discretionary, City General Funds, School District, Housing Authority; Other; Local Private Foundations, National/Regional Foundations, Corporations (direct)
Boston **Boston 2:00-to-6:00 After-School Initiative** A division of Boston Centers for Youth & Families Kathleen Traphagen, Executive Director, Kathleen.Traphagen@cityofboston.gov	1998	Municipal Office	No	$16M	Local-City General Funds, Mayor's Discretionary, Local and National Foundations
Charlotte **Partners in Out-of-School Time (POST)** Claire Tate, Director, ctate@postcarolinas.org	1999	Self-Standing Organization/ Capacity Building Intermediary	Yes	$500,000	Local Private Foundations, National/Regional Foundations. CCDBG - quality funds from state

	Year Initiative Began	Type of Lead Organization	Does the Initiative Provide Direct Programming?	Level of Funding	Revenue Sources
Chicago **Youth Services Division** Renae Ogletree, Director, rogletree@cityofchicago.org	1995	Partnership of non-profit and city government agency	Yes	$30M	CDBG-Funds to State and Communities; Local-Mayor's Discretionary, City General Funds, Community Development Block Grant; Dept. of Health & Human Services; Illinois Dept. of Health & Human Services
Columbus **CAP City Kids** Hannah Dillard, Director of Office of Education, Mayor's Office for Education, ghdillard@cmhmetro.net	2001	Municipal Office	Yes	$3.4M	DOE-21st CCLC, Safe and Drug Free Schools; Communities in Schools Grants, Funds to States and Communities; Parks and Recreation; Local-Mayor's Discretionary, City General Funds, School District, Housing Authority, Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Zone, Community Development Block Grant; Other- Local Private Foundations, United Way
Dallas **DISD Before and After School Programs** Mary Taylor, Coordinator for the Dallas Public Schools' Office of After School Programs, mtaylor@dallasisd.org	1995	School District	Yes	$3.4M	TANF; DOE- 21st CCLC, Title 1; CACFP or School Lunch Program; Grants for After School Programming; State Child Care Funds; Parks and Recreation; Local-School District; Other-Corporations (direct), Parent Fees
Denver **Department of Community Education: Denver Public Schools** Shirley Farnsworth, Director of Community Education, Shirley_Farnsworth@dpsk12.org	1992	School District	Yes	$5M	Grants for After School Programming; Other-Local Private Foundations, Corporate Foundations
Detroit **Mayor's Office for Youth** Grenae' Dudley, Executive Director, gdudley@msms.org	1996	Municipal Office	Yes	$2.6M	

	Year Initiative Began	Type of Lead Organization	Does the Initiative Provide Direct Programming?	Level of Funding	Revenue Sources
Houston **The After School Achievement Program (ASAP)** Rose Mary Garza, Assistant Superintendent for School Support Services, Houston, rgarza@houstonisd.org	1997	Municipal Office, School District	Yes	$1.4M	Funds to States and Communities; Other; Local-City General Funds, Community Development Block Grant
Kansas City **Caring Communities Before and After** Gayle A. Hobbs, Executive Director, ghobbskc@kclinc.org	1999	Public/Private Capacity-Building Intermediary Community Mobilization Organization	No	$10.1M	CCDF/CCDBG; DOE-Title 1, GEAR-UP;CACFP or School Lunch Program; 4-H Youth Development Program; Grants for After School Programming; State Child Care Funds; Local-School District; Other-Local Private Foundations, Corporate Foundation, Corporations (direct), Fundraisers/Individual Donations
Los Angeles **Better Educated Students for Tomorrow** Carla Sanger, President and CEO, Csanger@mayor.ci.la.ca.us	1988	Municipal Office, Self-Standing Organization	Yes	$21.5M	DOE- 21st CCLC, Safe and Drug Free Schools, CDBG- Funds to States and Communities, State Education Funding- Grants from After School Programming, Education Funds to LEAs; State Criminal Justice- Other; Local- City General Funds, Other, Local and Private Foundations, Charitable Organizations, National/ Regional Foundations, Corporate Foundations, Corporations (direct), Fundraisers/ Individual Donations
Los Angeles **Beyond the Bell** John Liechty, Assistant Superintendent for Extended Day Programs, jliechty@lausd.k12.ca.us	2000	School District	Yes	$36M	DOE- 21st CCLC, Safe and Drug Free Schools; CDBG- Funds to States and Communities; State Education Funding-Grants from After School Programming, Grants for Reading/ Academic Support; State Criminal Justice- Other; Local-City General Funds, School District, Other School Funding

	Year Initiative Began	Type of Lead Organization	Does the Initiative Provide Direct Programming?	Level of Funding	Revenue Sources
New York **The After-School Corporation (TASC)** Lucy Friedman, President, lfriedman@tascorp.org	1998	Self-Standing Organization	No	$80M	DHHS- CCDF/CCDBG, TANF; DOE- 21st CCLC; DOJ- Other, CACFP or School Lunch Program; Corporation for National Service-Americorps; CDBG- Funds to States and Communities; Other Federal; State Education Funding- Grants for After School Programming, Education Funds to LEAs; State Human Services- Other; Local- City General Funds, School District, Other School Funding, Community Devel Block Grant, Other Local; Other- Local Private Foundations, Charitable Organizations, United Way, National/Regional Foundations, Corporate Foundations, Corporations (direct), Parent Fees, Fundraisers/ Individual Donations; U.S. Department of Labor/Workforce Investment Act; Workforce Investment Act
New York **Youth Development Institute New York City Beacons** Peter Kleinbard, Vice President of the Fund for the City of New York (FCNY), pkleinbard@fcny.org	1991	Municipal Office	Yes	$36M	Local - Other; Other-Local Private Foundations
Philadelphia **Mayor John Street's Children's Investment Strategy** Jo Ann Lawer, President and CEO, Philadelphia Safe & Sound, jrlawer@earthlink.net	2000	Municipal Office	Yes	$30M	TANF; HSDF
St. Louis **St. Louis Public Schools-Community Education Initiative** John Windom, Executive Director for Community Education, charvey@dtd1.slps.k12.mo.us	1968	School District	Yes	$2.3M	Local: School District, Community Development Block Grant

	Year Initiative Began	Type of Lead Organization	Does the Initiative Provide Direct Programming?	Level of Funding	Revenue Sources
San Diego **San Diego's "6 to 6" Extended School Day** Deb Ferrin, Child Care Coordinator, City of San Diego, dferrin@sandiego.gov	1998	Municipal Office	Yes	$17M	DOE-21st CCLC; Funds to States and Communities, Grants for After School Programming; Tobacco Settlement; Local-City General Funds
San Fransisco **Community Network for Youth Development / San Francisco Beacons Initiative** Sam Piha, Director Community School Partnerships, sam@cnyd.org	1994	Capacity-Building Intermediaty	Yes	$5.6M	DOE-21st CCLC; Americorps; Local-City General Funds, School District, Other School Funding; Other Local Private Foundations, United Way, National/Regional Foundations
Seattle **City of Seattle, Project Lift-Off** Billie Young, Manager Child Development Programs, Billie.Young@ci.seattle.wa.us	1998	Municipal Office	Yes	$5.4M	CCDF/CCDBG; DOE-21st CCLC; Other Federal; Parks and Recreation; Local-City General Funds, School District, Other Local; Other-Local Private Foundations, Charitable Organizations, United Way, National/Regional Foundations, Corporate Foundations, Corporations (Direct), Fundraisers/Individual Donations
Washington, DC **Children and Youth Investment Corporation** Greg Roberts, Executive Director groberts@cyitc.org	1999	Public/ Private Partnership	No	$8.5M	Local and TANF

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").